

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 16 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these claims in this or another application. The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 4, 9 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner is further thanked for the indication that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection and to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claims 4, 9 and 18 each have been rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection and to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from independent claim 4 while claim 15 has been amended to depend from independent claim 14.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 9, 14 and 18, and any claims depending indirectly or directly therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been added by these amendments and no estoppels are intended thereby. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

OFFICE ACTION

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed in the *Status of the Claims* section of this Paper, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to provide antecedent basis for “the spring.” Accordingly, no further elaboration is believed necessary and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

(1) Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy (U.S. Patent 2,685,464). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant notes that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (quoting *Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Without conceding the propriety of the prior art rejection, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 16 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 16 is respectfully requested.

(2) Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olsen (U.S. Patent 2,037,144). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Again, without conceding the propriety of the prior art rejection, claim 11 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to this claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

(1) Claims 5, 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 2,685,464) in view of Marsi (U.S. Patent No. 4,448,428). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. M.P.E.P. § 2143. There must also be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references. *Id.* Applicant respectfully submits that these criteria for obviousness have not been satisfied.

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from independent claim 4, which was rewritten in independent form in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and therefore claim 5 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason. Claim 10 indirectly depends from claim 4 and is believed allowable for at least this reason. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 14 which has been rewritten in independent form in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection to claims 5, 10 and 15 is respectfully requested.

(2) Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 2,685,464) in view of Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 2,037,144). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the prior art rejection, claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 13, 16 and 19 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims.

Claim 17 depends from independent claim 18 which was indicated allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 is allowable for at least this reason

For at least the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of this rejection to claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 19 is respectfully submitted.

(3) Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 2,685,464) in view of Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 2,037,144), and further in view of Crawford (U.S. Patent 5,116,066). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 20 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to this claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No extension-of-time fee is believed due. However any extension of time necessary to prevent abandonment is hereby requested, and any fee necessary for consideration of this response is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at 202/861-1714.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Stephen S. Fabry
Registration No. 51,661

Date: 3/15/05
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel. 202 861 1500
Fax. 202 861 1783